Application No. Applicant(s) SHAUGHNESSY ET AL. 09/491.982 Interview Summary Examiner Art Unit 1646 Prema M. Mertz All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel): (1) Prema M. Mertz (Primary Examiner). (2) Yu Lu (Attorney). Date of Interview: 17 March 2005. Type: a)⊠ Telephonic b)□ Video Conference 2) applicant's representative] c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e)□ No. If Yes, brief description: Claim(s) discussed: 1,3,14 and 43-50. Identification of prior art discussed: Girasole et al (1995) in view of Kishimoto et al. (US Patent No. 5,888,510). Agreement with respect to the claims f was reached. g was not reached. f N/A. Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The 35 USC 103 rejection was discussed. Applicants would review the specification to find support for the limitation "increased bone resorption and decreased bone formation" to obviate a 35 USC 112, first paragraph new matter rejection because of the recitation of "and". (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.) THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required